REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough examination of the claims as evidenced in the Office Action dated May 11, 2006. Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejections to the claims contained therein.

Claims 1, 9 and 15 have been amended by this Response. Claims 1-19 are currently pending in the application. No new matter has been entered by the amendments hereto.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4 and 6-7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0032884 to Kobata et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Kobata discloses a message delivery system designed for use in a computer network such as the Internet. The system is characterized by a sender sending successive blocks of data to a receiver. When the connection between the sender and receiver is disconnected, the receiver listens for the message to which the blocks of data belong, and sends a message to the sender instructing the sender to transmit data at the point where the message was interrupted. As summarized in the Abstract: "The result is a restartable transfer of the transmission of the information from the sender to the receiver from the place where it left off...."

In contrast, amended claim 1 recites that a receiving node sends a response to a sending node indicating the results of a comparison between a description of a completely sent message and the message itself. A portion of the sent message is transmitted by the sending node if the comparison indicates that the receiving node has not yet received the portion of the sent message. This is different from the system disclosed by Kobata, which requests un-received portions of a message before the entire message has been sent by the sending node. Additionally, the network in Kobata is described as being a computer network, such as the Internet, instead of the wireless network recited in applicants' claim 1. Because Kobata does not wait until completely sending a message to the receiving node before requesting blocks of data from a sending node, and because Kobata does not disclose a wireless network, as claimed in applicants' claim 1, claim 1 is therefore allowable. Claims 2-8 depend directly or

– 6 –

indirectly from allowable claim 1 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons claim 1 is allowable.

With respect to claim 2, the receiving node of the system of Kobata requests, at step 32 of Figure 2, a specified block of data beginning where the message from sender was interrupted. The size of the block of data, called blocksize, is not described as having any correlation to the size of the portion of the sent message that has not been received. Because the system of Kobata focuses on restarting data transmission at a point of interruption, it is not necessary to determine how much data is missing. The sending node of Kobata only needs to know where to resume data transmission, and the value of blocksize likely has more to do with transmission capabilities than the amount of unreceived data. Claim 2, which recites that the receiving node identifies a size of the portion of the sent message that has not been received, is therefore allowable for at least this additional reason.

With respect to claim 4, Kobata does not disclose that the receiving node identifies the size of the received message. The Examiner points out that the size of the received message can be known through simple subtraction. However, such a subtraction is not disclosed as being performed by the system of Kobata, and this subtraction operation is not necessary for the system of Kobata to function. Because Kobata does not disclose a receiving node identifying the size of a received message, claim 4 is allowable for at least this additional reason.

The Examiner rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobata in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,734,643 to Rondeau. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claim 5 depends from allowable claim 1 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons claim 1 is allowable.

The Examiner rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobata in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,567,395 to Miller. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claim 8 depends from allowable claim 1 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons claim is allowable.

The Examiner rejected claims 9-12, 14 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobata in view of Miller, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,553,263 to Smith et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Applicant has amended independent claim 9 to recite that the sent information about the transmitted

– 7 –

message is compared to a received message that was completely sent by the first node and received by the second node. As previously explained, Kobata does not wait to retransmit portions of a message until the message is completely sent, and claim 9 is therefore allowable.

Claims 10-14 depend from allowable claim 9 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons claim 9 is allowable. Furthermore, claims 10-11 recite subject matter similar to allowable claims 2 and 4, respectively, and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons claims 2 and 4 are allowable.

Claim 19 depends from claim 15, which is allowable as will be demonstrated hereunder. Claim 19 is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons claim 15 is allowable.

The Examiner rejected claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobata in view of Miller and Smith, and further in view of Rondeau. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claim 13 depends from allowable claim 9 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons claim 9 is allowable.

The Examiner rejected claims 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobata in view of Smith. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Applicants have amended claim 15 to recite that the second node is configured to determine, after the message is completely sent and using the information in the inquiry command, whether the sent message was correctly received. As previously explained, Kobata does not wait to retransmit portions of a message until the message is completely sent, and claim 15 is therefore allowable.

Claims 16-19 depend from allowable claim 15 and are therefore allowable as well. Furthermore, Kobata does not disclose that the second node (the receiver) is configured to identify to the first node the size of the portion of the sent message that was not received, as recited in applicants' claim 16. As previously explained, the size of the retransmitted blocks of data (blocksize) has no disclosed correlation to the size of the unreceived portions of the message. Claim 16 is therefore allowable for at least this additional reason.

The Examiner rejected claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobata and Smith, and further in view of Rondeau. Applicants respectfully traverse

-- 8 --

this rejection. Claim 18 depends from allowable claim 15 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons claim 15 is allowable.

Accordingly, with entry of the amendments and consideration of the arguments and remarks contained herein, all pending claims are now allowable, and a notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney if further issues remain in the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,

Nathan O. Jensen
Reg. No. 41,460
Attorney for Applicant

Rockwell Collins Inc.
Intellectual Property Department
400 Collins Road NE M/S 124-323
Cedar Rapids, IA 52498
Telephone: (319) 295-1184
Facsimile No. (319) 295-8777
Customer No.: 26383

-- 9 --